THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX JULY, 1946 No. 313

Editorial

THE Report of the Commission appointed by the British Council of Churches on *The Era of Atomic Energy* (S.C.M. Press, 2s.) will not have satisfied anyone, least of all the members of the Commission. They would have been false prophets if they had cried, "A solution, a solution," when no solution is in sight. They had to be content with providing a tolerably full account of the facts and factors which must be reckoned with by any Church that proposes to supply guidance to its members. It is not the office of the British Council of Churches to take the place of Convocations or Assemblies, but it can supply, and in this case has supplied, the Convocations and Assemblies with information and illumination which they could not so easily have come by if left each to its own resources.

While the Commission faced and exposed the problems raised by atomic warfare, it refused to let them dominate its Report. On the tormenting question whether it can ever be right, or the least of all possible evils, to participate in "total" war the members were not agreed, but they were agreed that this is not the only nor the crucial question. If atomic warfare comes it is a question that is hardly likely to have much reality. But the dilemma already exists and can be posed in simple terms. On the one hand, such a war cannot conceivably be just in any traditional or positive sense. The Commission says this unequivocally. On the other hand, for a Great Power to renounce atomic weapons and, the obvious corollary of that, to embark on unilateral disarmament would be to abandon the responsibility of defending its national existence and way of life. There seems to be no present escape from this dilemma. Let anyone who supposes that there is a way out make sure he has fully weighed all the considerations which the Commission adduces.

But rightly, we think, it seeks to show that the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy only intensify the crisis of our civilization, which was already there. The task of the Church is to lay bare the nature of this crisis in all its dimensions, and in Britain to press to a head the question for what principles and way of life the nation is prepared to stand and, if need be, to perish. Here the Commission gathers together the fruits of much important thinking that has been done by Christians in recent years. The trouble is that it has not yet been expressed—and is not expressed here—in a way that can be expected to capture the imagination of all sorts and conditions of men.

There are two questions about which, we suggest, the Commission might have spoken more clearly. It seems to say that the bringing into being of "a formally constituted world government," if it were practical politics, would be obviously desirable. It is true that, only

if atomic energy is under the control of a single power, whether international or national, is it likely that atomic warfare can be prevented. But the establishment of a world government armed with atomic power, even if at the outset it were the product of a new kind of world community, would offer such an appalling prospect of world tyranny that even the destruction of civilization might be better than that. This is yet another irresolvable dilemma, and the Commission may have thought that it had pointed to enough of these without developing this particular predicament, which anyhow does not at present seem likely to arise.

Nor does the Commission grasp as firmly or as candidly as we could wish the question whether or in what sense Britain is still a Great Power or how long she can be expected to remain so. On p. 41 it seems to be assumed that Britain must continue to act as a nation that has the inevitable responsibility that attaches to Great Power status. But on p. 78 we are told:

> We may thus in this country be confronted with a fateful choice. We may have to make up our minds whether we shall compete in the international race for power and devote every energy to holding our own in that race, or whether we shall regard it as our historical destiny and mission to offer to the world an example of a truer and better way of living.

It may be premature for statesmen to speak openly yet about this choice. But it is not too soon for churchmen to be pressing for consideration of it, and preparing the nation to see its destiny and mission in quite fresh terms.

* * * * *

To our great regret, Dr Cockin has found it necessary to resign from the advisory committee of THEOLOGY owing to the fresh demands that will be made upon him as Bishop of Bristol. We are thankful for all the help he has given us. The committee has also often enjoyed the hospitality of his house or office for its meetings. The members of the advisory committee are not, of course, committed to all the opinions which the editor expresses, but he finds their advice, suggestions and, not least, their criticism invaluable. We are glad to say that the Rev. Frank Bennett, who has lately been appointed Rector of Wigan, has kindly consented to take Dr Cockin's place on the committee. He may be expected particularly to watch the interests of parish priests.

Zeger Bernhard Van Espen[1]

THREE hundred years ago, on July 9, 1646, there was born at Louvain a man who became one of the most outstanding canonists of the post-Tridentine era and whose life and work should, for reasons

[1] The best edition of the works of Van Espen is that published at Louvain in 1753, in four folio volumes. In 1768 a fifth volume, *Supplementum ad varias collectiones operum clarissimi viri Zegeri Bernardi Van-Espen*, appeared at Brussels. This is more important biographically than the other volumes as it contains his correspondence, the materials concerning the Church of Utrecht, and the various proceedings taken against him in

which will appear, be of particular interest to Anglicans. Zeger Bernhard Van Espen was the son of a rich burgher of Louvain. He was educated first by the Oratorians at Tamise or Temsche, and then studied philosophy at the Collège du Parc in the University of Louvain. After completing the course there in 1665 he took the ecclesiastical habit and attended the law schools, becoming Dean of the Bachelors, and in 1670 Licentiate. A period of theological study followed, and he was ordained priest on May 27, 1673. In the following year he was appointed a professor of canon law in the University, his duties being to lecture for six weeks during the summer vacation. The professorship was joined to a canonry of the second order in the Collegiate Church of St Peter, which obliged him to attend the offices on Sundays and festivals. This was the only chair he held in the University, and he eventually resigned it in order to devote himself entirely to study and to giving advice about the many matters on which he was consulted. All the time he lived on his private income and gave the revenues of his chair and canonry to the poor.

In 1675 Van Espen became a Doctor of Civil and Canon Law, and two years later took up his residence in the Pope's College (so called after Adrian VI, its founder) at Louvain. Here he lived until 1702, and this was, in many ways, the happiest period of his life. In his *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum* he gives the timetable and customs of the College as a model of what an ecclesiastical seminary should be. He was himself a pattern of regularity in life. He was always in chapel at 5 a.m., and there he prayed and meditated until 7 a.m., when he said or served Mass. The half-hour from 2.30 to 3 p.m. was also spent in meditation in the chapel or the garden. The rest of the day was occupied in study, with occasional lectures.

In his *Apologia pro Fuga* Van Espen tells us that from the time of taking his Doctor's degree he gave himself particularly to the study of the Canon Law rather than the Civil, because he considered it more consonant with his profession. He continues: "But immediately I observed that many Canonists, or rather Decretalists, who were not sufficiently versed in ecclesiastical antiquities, had laid down principles which were not well founded or had supported sound principles by weak arguments and often by forged documents. I went therefore to the sources, that is to the holy councils, the decrees of Roman Pontiffs, bishops, and princes, together with the commentaries of learned men and other writers of good fame. There I saw clearly that a chief and pre-eminent authority had always been acknowledged in the Roman Pontiff, but that this was very different from the immense and undefined power which for some centuries had been ascribed to him by

the last ten years of his life. In 1767 the Abbé Du Pac de Bellegarde, who seems to have been connected with the formation of the supplementary volume, published anonymously, as an introduction to it, a *Vie de M. Van Espen.* This was translated into Latin and prefixed to the edition of the Supplement published at Lyons in 1778. De Bellegarde relied particularly on the recollections of Jean Willemaers, at one time professor of rhetoric at the College of the Holy Trinity, Louvain, and later President of the Seminary at Amersfoort. Other material bearing on some of the cases in which Van Espen was involved will be found in *Mémoires historiques sur l'affaire de la Bulle Unigenitus dans les Pays Bas autrichiens, 1713-30,* four volumes published in 1755.

many writers, and which the men of the Roman curia . . . were everywhere trying to advance, not without harm to the authority of bishops and parish priests and of the supreme princes and magistrates themselves. And so I thought that it would not be useless, particularly in our country of Belgium, if I published some treatises in which I tried, by separating the certain matters from the doubtful, to explain the ancient and the modern disciplines and show how far the two could be reconciled." The outstanding result of this work was the *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum*, which will be discussed more fully in a second article, but the motives declared in this paragraph run through the greater part of Van Espen's scholarly work. We have a number of the courses of lectures which he gave as professor of Canon Law. Among them are *Tractatus de Veneratione Sanctorum, Reliquiis eorum et Sacris Imaginibus*, *Tractatus brevis de Sacris Congregationibus*, *Tractatus de Jure Ecclesiastico Belgico*, *Reflexiones ad aliquas Regulas Juris*, *Tractatus de Ecclesiastica et Politica potestate*, *Dissertatio canonica de dispensationibus*. The last of these was delivered in 1684 and was denounced to the Internuncio, Tanara, at Brussels. He complained to the Dean of the Faculty of Law that Van Espen was teaching things against the authority of the Holy See. The Dean defended Van Espen and Tanara then demanded the manuscript of the lectures, but the Faculty was loath to admit his jurisdiction and the matter was allowed to drop. Similar trouble occurred in July 1718 in connexion with the treatise on ecclesiastical and civil power. In the course of the lectures, after he had discussed what powers the bishops possessed in common with the Pope, Van Espen had the misfortune to dislocate his foot and, being then an old man of seventy-two, he had to break off his lectures for some weeks. During the interval some of his enemies at Louvain denounced him to the Internuncio for having taught principles contrary to the authority of the Pope. Van Espen explained that an accident had prevented him from going on to treat of those matters which belonged to the Papal Primacy but that he proposed to do so as soon as he had recovered. This explanation did not, however, avail to stop the case, which was taken before the Imperial Court at Vienna. He was eventually allowed to resume his lectures. The treatise on the cult of the saints, which was intended to restrain some of the new and exuberant devotions of the seventeenth century, also caused trouble and was denounced to the Archbishop of Malines and to the Government in January 1692. The denunciation prevented Van Espen from being appointed to a more important chair of law which became vacant at that time.

In addition to his work on Ecclesiastical History and Canon Law, Van Espen was also a devout student of Holy Scripture, and in the Pope's College he was very useful as a teacher. When he arrived Ecclesiastical History was somewhat neglected, and so he was able to fill a gap. Every week he voluntarily gave a lecture on the General and Local Councils. He continually maintained that neglect of Church History was a capital fault in an ecclesiastic. He is said to have been very simple in his habits, to have been always kind and affable. His room was invariably open to everyone who wished to see him—his

declared enemies as well as his friends. In 1702 Van Espen left the Pope's College and went to live with his niece in the town, and it is about this time that his troubles begin. We have seen already that he had enemies among the ultramontane party in Belgium, but in order to understand the persecutions which Van Espen suffered it is necessary to go back somewhat in the story.

It will be allowed by many that the Jansenist movement,[1] which agitated the Roman Catholic Church so violently in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and is still a dreadful bogy, derived its strength as much, if not more, from being a protest against the lax moral theology of the Jesuits, as from being an assertion of certain elements in the Augustinian doctrine of grace. There were many, especially in France and Belgium, who would not have accepted what is said to have been the strict Jansenist doctrine, but felt considerable sympathy with the protest that was being made, and a great respect for the characters of the protestants. As Dr Leighton Pullan says: "The Gallican theologians, who believed that a Pope is subject to an Œcumenical Council of the Church, joined with the Jansenists in opposing certain prominent Jesuits who defended so lax a system and maintained propositions so scandalous that they treated hardly any sin as really guilty, and were taunted with taking away the sins of the world by treating them as non-existent."[2] This combination of Jansenism and Gallicanism was particularly marked in the second stage of the controversy, that which centres on Père Quesnel and his *Réflexions Morales sur le Nouveau Testament.*

Belgium and Holland were the real centre and headquarters of the Jansenist movement, although the story of Port-Royal is better known. Jansen himself had been a professor at Louvain and had died as Bishop of Ypres. His strongly Augustinian teaching was somewhat of a tradition in Belgium, and his followers were protected and favoured by two Archbishops of Malines—Jacques Boonen (1621-55) and Alphonse de Berghes (1671-90). Boonen did not publish the constitution of Urban VIII condemning Jansen's *Augustinus*, and he was suspended for a time by Innocent X. During his archiepiscopate he encouraged the Oratorians to settle in Belgium and to open schools. We have seen that Van Espen was educated in their establishment at Tamise. They too were in opposition to the Jesuits. Archbishop de Berghes was a patron of Van Espen, who was to have accompanied him to Rome on a visit which did not materialize. After his death, however, there was a violent change. Humbert Guillaume Precipiano, who became Archbishop in 1690, was a declared anti-Jansenist and a friend of the Jesuits. In many ways he came into conflict with Van Espen. Soon after his arrival he introduced the anti-Jansenist formula of Alexander VII with the addition of certain explanations of his own, and although

[1] The most recent account in English of the Jansenist movement is that by N. Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism*, 1936. The reader may also be referred to L. Pullan, *Religion since the Reformation*, 1923, and to L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages* (English translation by E. Graf), Vols. XXXI-XXXIII, 1940-41.

[2] L. Pullan, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

his proceedings were condemned at Rome great confusion was caused in the University of Louvain and elsewhere. Meanwhile, the Archbishop was carrying on a campaign against all who were suspected of rigorism or of sympathy with the Jansenist and conservative movements. Several times when parishes and other ecclesiastical offices became vacant attempts were made to prevent the appointment of priests connected with the old regime. The removal of others from the offices which they already held was also sought. These proceedings led to a number of conflicts with the civil authorities in which Van Espen was concerned. Sometimes he was consulted by priests who had been arbitrarily suspended from their functions, and he was able to defend them by insisting that the due processes of law should be followed. In other cases the doctrine of the Royal Placet was involved. The issues raised by this will be discussed in a later article. It will suffice now to say that in Belgium as in France the civil authorities insisted that papal decrees, before being published and enforced, should receive the Royal Approval. This had not been given in the case of a number of the anti-Jansenist decrees, and Van Espen was able to maintain therefore that the Archbishop's actions were illegal. The whole story is exceedingly complex, but behind it all lies a conflict between the Ultramontane-Jesuit party, and the various forms of Conservative-Gallican opposition. The Louvain Faculty of Theology complained with some reason in a letter to Pope Alexander VIII in 1690 that Jansenism was made the crime of those who had none, *crimen est omnium nullum crimen habentium.*

Precipiano died in 1711 and there was a short period of peace which, however, was broken by the advent of his successor, the Cardinal d'Alsace, in 1715. There were now further complications introduced by the constitutions condemning Quesnel and his doctrine, *Vineam Domini*, 1705, and *Unigenitus*, 1713. Van Espen had known and corresponded with Quesnel and considered the condemnation of his teaching to be an attack on Catholic doctrine, not only as found in the Bible and the writings of the Fathers but also in the decrees of the Council of Trent. His objections to the Constitution *Unigenitus* are set out in a Memoir attached to a letter of July 1727, addressed to the Archduchess Marie Elizabeth of Austria, Governor of the Low Countries. Hitherto he had been able to secure the support of the civil power, but with the appointment of the Archduchess in 1725 the position changed. The new Governor was in ecclesiastical matters under the influence of her Jesuit confessor, Fr Amiot, and at the same time the Comte de Baillet, also an associate of the Jesuits, became President of the Grand Council of Malines. A veritable Inquisition consisting of these two and the Archbishop established itself. For many years Van Espen had been left personally untouched in the matter of the Constitution *Unigenitus*, but in 1727, when he seemed about to be acquitted for his defence of the Church of Utrecht (to be mentioned presently), he was suddenly visited by a representative of the Archbishop, who demanded of him a renewal of the Profession of Faith of Pius IV, the signature with oath of the anti-Jansenist Formulary of Alexander VII, and the pure and simple acceptance of the Constitution *Unigenitus*. Unless he

submitted within five days he was to be prosecuted according to the rigour of the canons and deprived of the Sacraments. He was eighty-one, and had been for fifty years a respected teacher in a Catholic university, and he was now treated as a heretic who must submit to certain conditions in order to be received back into the Church. He was gravely ill at the time but recovered sufficiently to be able to defend himself and to secure the support of the Council of Brabant and of important elements in the University. Eventually, however, it became necessary for his personal safety that he should retire to Maastricht, and the Rector of Louvain declared him deprived of all his university functions.

It is now time to turn to Van Espen's dealings with the Church of Holland. The full story of the beginnings of the Old Catholic schism cannot be told here, and the reader must be referred to other accounts such as that of Dr Neale.[1] Many of the Dutch clergy had been trained at Louvain, and some of the most prominent men in the Church of Utrecht were pupils and friends of Van Espen. He was consulted by them in their difficulties from 1702 onwards, and there exists a considerable correspondence between him and Archbishop Codde during the time of the latter's suspension. Codde died in 1710, and the see was vacant for thirteen years as the Chapter of Utrecht were unable to get permission from Rome to elect a successor. Among their difficulties was that of providing for the ordination of new priests during the long vacancy. Van Espen and his colleague Opstraet advised that theological students should be sent to sympathetic bishops in France to be trained and ordained on letters dimissory from the Chapter. This was done, and the Bishops of Bayeux, Blois, and Sénez all performed ordinations for Utrecht. Some priests were also ordained by Luke Fagan, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Meath. In February 1719 the first suggestion seems to have been made to Van Espen by the Dean of Utrecht, Van Erkel, that the Chapter might proceed to the election of an Archbishop without Papal permission, but no positive reply was given until August 1722, when he encouraged the Dutch to proceed with this plan. The authorities at Utrecht drew up a justification of their proposed action, which was put in order and approved by Van Espen and three other Louvain doctors and was supported by some of the French universities, notably Paris, Rheims, and Nantes. They were also encouraged by the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, and a number of other French bishops. Finally, on April 27, 1723, Cornelius Steenoven was elected Archbishop of Utrecht and was consecrated on October 15, 1724, by Dominique Marie Varlet, Bishop of Babylon. Attempts had been made to get the assistance of other bishops, but although many expressed sympathy none would come. The Archbishop therefore had one consecrator only, and this gave rise to attacks by the Ultramontanes against the validity as well as the regularity of the consecration. Once again Van

[1] J. M. Neale, *A History of the So-called Jansenist Church of Holland*, 1858. A shorter and more recent account will be found in N. P. Williams and C. Harris, *Northern Catholicism*, 1933, pp. 531 *ff.*

Espen, at the request of Van Erkel, came to the support of the Church of Utrecht, and in 1725 published his *De numero Episcoporum ad validam Ordinationem Episcopi requisito Responsio Epistolaris*. This was at once denounced by Spinelli, the Internuncio at Brussels, who secured its initial condemnation by the Grand Council of Malines, but Van Espen was able to defend himself successfully, and in 1726 he wrote a full defence of the Church of Utrecht. Proceedings were still pending against him, however, on account of the *Responsio Epistolaris* and, as has been said already, in 1727 his position was further complicated by the attacks on him as a Jansenist.

Van Espen remained at Maastricht from the end of February to July 1728, during which time he worked at the material for his defence. Some attempts were made to kidnap him and to abuse his extreme age and frailty to extract a forced retraction and so, for greater safety, he was urged to go into Holland. The States-General ordered a military escort to be given for his protection and he was received warmly by the Archbishop of Utrecht, Barchman, who had been one of his pupils, and the Bishop of Babylon. He established himself at the Seminary of Amersfoort, where the President, J. Willemaers, was an old friend of Louvain days, and there he enjoyed two months' peace before his death. One of his motives in leaving Louvain had been the fear that he might die deprived of the Sacraments. At the end of September 1728 he developed a slight fever, received the last Sacraments and died after a short illness on October 2. The Archbishop officiated at his funeral and he was buried in the vault of the noble family of Foeyt at the entrance to the choir of the Church of St George, then, as now, in the possession of the Protestants. His epitaph contains the words:

> *SS. Canonum consultissimus, integerrimusque interpres, multis lucubrationibus, virtutibus, persecutionibus clarus; Patriam maluit in extrema senectute quam justitiam et veritatem deserere.*

ERIC KEMP.

Cranmer and the Edwardine Prayer Books—II

BUT however inadequate the Eucharistic doctrine of Cranmer may have been, it does not follow that his own peculiar views found full expression in the English Mass of 1549, or even in that of 1552.

On historical evidence we know that the first Edwardine Prayer Book was compiled by a commission of divines, which included some of the more Catholic-minded.[1] Therefore, although it is clear that Cranmer bore the chief part in its composition, he had hardly a free hand. Furthermore, some of the Continental reformers complained that "certain concessions have been made both to a respect for the past and to the infirmity of the present."[2]

---

[1] *Cf. inter alia* Cranmer's letter to Mary, September 1555: "A great number of learned men of both sorts (some favouring the old and some the new learning) were gathered at Windsor for the reformation of the service of the Church," *Remains*, Parker Soc., 450.

[2] Letter of Bucer and Fagius, *Original Letters*, 535.

The contents of the book certainly bear this out. To deal with the service of the "Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," we see that it is based upon the Sarum Mass, the order of which it follows. The Canon, beginning with the prayer for "the whole state of Christ's Church" and continuing with the Prayer of Consecration, and that of Oblation and the Our Father, closely follows the structure of the Latin Canon, of which it is largely a free paraphase, expressed with all that felicity in liturgical English in which Cranmer is admittedly a supreme master. The Intercession contains a prayer for the departed and a commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, together with the saints of both covenants. The Prayer of Consecration (as it was first termed in 1662) has an invocation of the Father to "bless and sanctify" with his "Holy Spirit and word these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy . . . son Jesus Christ." The words of Institution are followed by the Anamnesis of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, introduced, however, by the words, "we . . . do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty with these thy holy gifts the memorial which thy son hath willed us to make." These words, expressing the doctrine that the Mass is a memorial (but a memorial before God, not merely a means of reminding the worshippers) take the place of the "offering of the pure victim . . . the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation" in the Latin rite. Then follows the Prayer of Oblation, differing little from its 1552 and present form, but with a new version of the *Jube hæc perferri*, where "these things," which in the Latin are to be carried by "the Holy Angel to thine altar on high," are treated as "our prayers and supplications."[1] The Canon ends with the Our Father and the *Pax domini*. The present Communion devotions, dating from the "order of Communion" of 1548 and including the Prayer of Humble Access, precede the communion of the priest as well as that of the people. The words of administration are the same as those of the first half used in our present rite.

The chief strictures made at the time by the more conservative among the Bishops were the omission of "the adoration" (*i.e.*, the elevation of the host and chalice) and of "oblation."[2] Cranmer was no doubt well aware that the elevation was a late medieval ceremony, though his own views would have ruled it out in any case. He had also a rooted objection to allowing the oblation of any material thing, such as money as well as bread and wine, regarding it probably as a Jewish survival, if not derogatory to the sufficiency of the oblation made on the Cross. The word "oblations" was not added to the Prayer for the Church Militant till 1662.[3] But it is of the greatest importance to realize that the Prayer of Oblation (as it is generally now termed) is probably based on a Catholic work found in the Lambeth library and quoted by Cranmer himself—namely, the Anti-didagma[4]

[1] Innocent III held the same view; *v.* Brightman, *English Rite*, 694.

[2] Tomlinson, *Parliamentary Debate*, pp. 25 and 30.

[3] In 1552 alms were mentioned in the prayer but not placed on the altar.

[4] Antididagma, f. LVIII: "deinde offertur commune laudis et gratiarum actionis sacrificium (*a*) pro tota ecclesia. . . . Tertio facta consecratione Christus ipse offer-

of the Cologne Chapter drawn up in answer to their Lutheranizing Archbishop.[1]

We can understand now that the 1549 rite, so far from expressing Zwinglian or even Lutheran doctrine, could be continually quoted by Bishop Gardiner against the views expressed by Cranmer in the *Defence*, and that Gardiner could himself say, "that book he would not have made after that form, but, as it was, he could with his conscience keep it, and cause others in his diocese to keep it."[2]

The changes introduced in 1552 are well known. The Mass vestments were dropped, so were the prayer for the departed and the commemoration of the saints. The Invocation is altered to a prayer for the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ by the communicants. The Communion follows immediately on the words of Institution and precedes the Our Father and the Prayer of Oblation, which in view of its new position loses the anamnesis and the memorial made with the gifts, while the Prayer of Thanksgiving is made alternative to it. Even more serious perhaps is the change of the words of administration to the form, "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving," a form which would have satisfied Bullinger and perhaps Zwingli himself. And at the last moment the famous Black Rubric was added to the service.

Happily this rite received no authority from Convocation and lasted for less than a year. But it was revived again when Elizabeth came to the throne, though the older words of administration were prefixed to the 1552 form and the Black Rubric was dropped. The latter was indeed reinserted in 1662, but with the sting taken out of it by the substitution of "corporal" for "real and essential," while other changes in a Catholic direction produced our present Prayer Book. It remains, however, a fact that our present rite is largely that of the second Edwardine book. How far does it satisfy Catholic standards? First, let it be said that in using the elements of bread and wine with the full intention of doing what our Lord did at the Last Supper and with a consecratory prayer which contains the words of Institution, the essentials of a valid rite are fulfilled,[3] especially when it is remembered that it was provided that the minister must be a priest who has received episcopal ordination. Secondly, the traditional structure is still broadly followed, retaining such features as the Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Creed, the Intercession for the Church, Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus, Consecration, Communion and Thanks-

tur, corpus eius et sanguis eius, et sacratissima ipsius passio, per commemorationem et representationem eius (*b*), ac quarto demum offertur Ecclesia ipsa et tota Christi communitas, quæ se Deo Patri in hac sacrosancta actione dedicat et sacrificat (*c*)."

(*a*) Compare with this the 1549 prayer, "accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving"; (*b*) " make here before thy divine majesty with these thy holy gifts [which in virtue of the Invocation and words of Institution are now 'for us the body and blood . . . of Jesus Christ'] the memorial which Thy son hath willed us to make' "; (*c*) "and here we offer and present unto thee . . . ourself, our souls and bodies to be a reasonable holy and lively sacrifice unto thee."

[1] *v. Church Quarterly Review*, January 1891, and Brightman, *English Rite*, 694.

[2] Foxe, ed. 1837, vi. 114.

[3] *Cf.* St Thomas, *Summa*, III, qu. 78, art. 1.

giving. The offertory, or at least the placing of the bread and wine on the altar, if not explicitly directed, is presupposed at some point before the Consecration, and the fraction, though again not directed, was customary from some date, at any rate before 1662.[1] And the Prayer of Oblation, even in its 1552 form and position, makes it clear that the intention of the rite is not merely to offer praise and thanksgiving but to implore the Divine pardon and all the other benefits of our Lord's Passion for the whole Church of God, both living and departed (for the qualification "militant here on earth" is conspicuous by its absence.) It should also be noted that the Second Prayer Book did not satisfy the foreign reformers. Calvin said it contained many "tolerable foolish things" (*tolerabiles ineptiæ*), and one of the English Protestant exiles complains that Cranmer had not a free hand even here, "for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and convocation and other enemies" (*v. Troubles at Frankfort*, pp. xxxv and L).

With the improvements made in Elizabeth's time and at the 1662 revision, and still more when the ancient order is restored at least to the extent of restoring the Prayer of Oblation and the Our Father to their traditional place after the Prayer of Consecration, we have a rite which, in spite of omissions and deformations, serves as an adequate means of pleading the Sacrifice of Calvary and partaking of its fruits. Surely the road of liturgical advance for Anglicans lies in preserving the rich liturgical language of Archbishop Cranmer, while returning as far as is practicable to his first liturgical effort, when the Catholic sense of the country was strong enough to resist the innovations both of Zurich and of Geneva.

Note 1. The Prayer of Oblation has been given an official interpretation in the Reply of the Archbishops to Leo XIII, an interpretation which was formally accepted by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 (*vide* Report, Resolution 33*c*, p. 49). The passage quoted at the Conference runs as follows (p. 136): "Further we truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a 'nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross,' an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that Council [Trent]. But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist,—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ –to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice."

Note 2. It has been objected that the Prayer of Oblation, at any rate in its 1552 (and present) form, is inadequate, because it makes no explicit offering of the gifts, although such offering is found universally in the ancient liturgies. But it should be pointed out that we do offer "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," which takes up the *sacrificium laudis* of the Latin canon. This is found in the old Latin version of Leviticus vii, 13, where it is a translation of the LXX θυσία αἰνέσεως and denotes

[1] Brightman, *English Rite*, CCXIX.

the peace offering in which the offerer partook of the offering with the priest. It does not there, of course, mean a sacrifice consisting of praise, but a sacrifice (and a material one, consisting of loaves) whereby praise is given. In view of this, whatever may have been in Cranmer's mind, the natural interpretation of the words in the Prayer of Oblation is "this sacrifice (consisting of the gifts now consecrated) whereby we give praise and thanksgiving."

(Concluded.)

H. Edward Symonds, C.R.

Christianity and Culture in the Thought of J. N. Figgis

Modern writers on religion all stress the need that exists for a synthesis between the ever-increasing bounds of knowledge and Christianity. The Master of Balliol, in his recent lecture "The Good and the Clever," has shown that goodness and cleverness are often presented as alternative gospels with dangerous results. Among the great intellectual leaders of the English Church who have achieved a fusion of the two principles in their own personalities, none stood out more clearly in the early years of this century than John Neville Figgis.

In his early university days at Cambridge Figgis shone as a man who could have achieved a First in any school; though a friend of his wrote: "Perhaps not in chemistry, for he would certainly have blown himself up and the whole laboratory." Widely learned in classics, mathematics, and history, he brought lustre to the name of his own college of St Catharine's by winning the Prince Consort prize for an essay on "The Divine Right of Kings," which became a classic in that particular field of political thought. Other books, including the famous study of ideas in politics from Gerson to Grotius, appeared from his pen. But like Gore he was not content to be only academic. Himself the son of the well-known Connection Church minister, Figgis of Brighton, John Neville developed under the influence of Mandell Creighton, a Cambridge tutor and friend, and after a short period of agnosticism became a full member of the Church of England, and later a priest and a member of the Community at Mirfield.

Another of his many friends wrote of Figgis that the appeal which he made was partly due to the fact that he represented in himself the fusion of the highest culture with the faith of Catholic Christianity; and in this he belonged to a long line of distinguished English scholars from Hooker to Gore and Scott Holland. This helps to explain the attraction which he had for undergraduates and all who were puzzling over the synthesis of new knowledge and old faith. Many found him an enigma, for modernists could not understand his position as a Catholic, and Catholics were suspicious of his interest in modernism.

Figgis had developed by much thought, voracious reading, painful struggle, and renunciation to the point where the whole of his brilliant mental gifts were consecrated to the service of Christ. He held that culture involves the development of all the faculties of men, and that

the level reached would depend on whether or not the highest faculties are cultivated: "The highest goods of culture will not persist apart from the spiritual ideal; they will cease to be thought of as goods, and their value will decay."

He sought to show that religion is the basis of all enduring culture, and he held that the criticism of the Church as alien to culture arises from the fact that she is known to prohibit certain actions and to inculcate self-denial. From this, the conclusion is drawn that she is inhuman and opposed to natural joy. Figgis pointed out that this was true only of certain over-developed forms of Puritanism, but that such a view neglected the beauty of medieval culture; St Francis of Assisi was in some ways a most thoroughgoing ascetic, yet his whole life was like "a child's smile on a dull day."

According to the author of *The Gospel and Human Needs* two fundamental errors were involved in the creation of an antithesis between culture and the Catholic religion: (1) a misconception of the Christian maxim "Die to live," and (2) the failure to see that this principle is true of all worthy human life, and is involved in the very nature of culture itself, for that implies selection. The maxim "Die to live" must be a postulate of all worthy education, and has been recognized as such by all the greatest teachers from Plato onwards; neither perfect bodily function nor brilliant mental gifts can come to fruition without a hard and stern discipline. Without the sacrifice of immediate goods to more distant ends no fair success can be achieved in any sphere of human endeavour. The Cross of Christ gives a meaning to all such struggles and is the symbol of all sacrifice for distant goals. So Figgis held that a high culture can only be achieved by an asceticism of the taste.

A humanist himself in the widest sense of the word, and one who could have lived happily in the time of the Renaissance, Figgis saw clearly the drift and dangers of modern civilization. These he traced in his brilliant lectures, "Civilization at the Crossroads," in which he brought his vast stores of historical learning and his mathematical intellect to bear on the problems besetting the men of his day. Writing in 1917, in the middle of the first world war, he pointed out that the morale and temper of the German people was the direct result of the marriage of European scepticism with State idolatry. "The sometime friend and pupil of Voltaire, Frederick the Great, is the symbol of it all."

Figgis lamented the seeping of education by narrow and material ends. If material success be the main criterion in education a vulgar and commercial spirit will decline to allow time and energy to be spent on fundamental problems. Even scientific research will not be honoured as soon as it is suspected that much of it is without practical value, and a society living on the mechanistic hypothesis "would soon begin to ask of poets what they are dreaming of and of musicians why they are so idle."

"On all hands," he wrote, "we see the gulf between a spiritual and a non-spiritual culture." If this was true in Figgis's own day it is even truer of the present when men are anxiously wondering how to control

the results which technical skill has let loose upon the world. How can the gulf be bridged? Figgis held that the solution was not to be found in Puritanism, always seductive to austere and severe minds, nor did he think that there would be much value in narrow ecclesiastical coteries. What would interest the secular world would be first to show the reality of Christian fellowship, and secondly to show that the highest and deepest culture is that of the Christian; that in all excellences of human endeavour, study, invention, artistic enthusiasm, social grace, wise and instructed statesmanship, the care for good books, there reigns in the Christian not less but more of the passion for knowledge than in his fellows.

It might be thought that Figgis here assumes a faith and a theological outlook and a resulting synthesis with culture in which not many could follow him. Actually the record of his life and work shows him constantly engaged in bringing about this fusion in the minds of others. In his famous Hulsean lectures he confessed that, if to others faith was a boon, to him it had seemed at times like "the angel of an agony." In these same lectures he had shown himself not only aware of the acids of misdirected Higher Criticism, but in a new kind of apologetic, offensive rather than defensive, he had shown how to meet it. He counselled men to hang on to faith "by their eyelids," and many still alive are grateful for his help and advice. He had delved deeply, not merely into the minds of those who attacked Christian faith but those who sought to undermine Christian morals. His penetrating study of Nietzsche was one of the first really able attempts by a Catholic writer to get to grips with the thought of this puzzling thinker. Unfortunately Figgis's book on the German writer, the *Will to Freedom*, is not as well known as it deserves to be.

Nor did this brilliant don fail to practise the humane and kindly side of the religion which always appears in his writings, almost as a discovery. There is a pleasing story of him when he held the living of Marnhull. On one occasion he was waylaid on his return from an early service by an old woman whose cow had died. Figgis immediately invited her into the rectory for breakfast, but when she arrived in the dining-room she was overcome and said: "Give me a cup of tea, sir, like I do at home, and something to dip in it." This Figgis at once proceeded to do, and she left later, not merely comforted but with something in her pocket towards the expense of a new cow. Rich in ability, the admired pupil of Maitland, the friend of Acton and of Creighton, Figgis fulfilled a vocation which he regarded as yet higher than the pursuit of those purely scholarly aims so dear to his heart.

Maurice G. Tucker.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Eric Kemp has recently been appointed Fellow and Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford.

Dr Symonds is a member of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield.

The Rev. M. G. Tucker is on the staff of Colston's School, Stapleton, Bristol.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND AND IN INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

No doubt Canon Peacey's letter in the May THEOLOGY, and your own editorial comments on it, will provoke replies from abler correspondents than myself. But I have this excuse for writing: that some time ago, through your good offices, an essay of mine was published in which I expressed an opinion of the lawlessness of the Church of England similar in many respects to Canon Peacey's; and precisely because I am in substantial agreement with him concerning the condition of the Church, I feel bound to say, as forcibly as I can, that I think the inferences he makes, and you make, are unjustified.

Although lawlessness is an evil, it ought not to be confused with abandonment of apostolic order. For priests to disobey bishops, even if it be in "things lawful and honest," is one thing; for a Church officially to declare itself uncertain about the nature of episcopacy, so that its intention in consecrating bishops becomes suspect, is quite another. Bishops do not cease to be bishops because they fail to secure discipline; nor do those who are not certainly bishops acquire valid orders by governing effectively. Consequently, to adduce the parable of the mote and the beam in this context is not happy.

But surely, sir, both you and Canon Peacey make a much graver mistake in supposing that we who condemn the South-Indian Scheme condemn it mainly on account of its treatment of episcopacy. By far the most serious objection to the Scheme is that it makes each and every clause of the Creed optional (ed. 1942, p. 5), and so opens the door to every heresy. And indeed, in respect of both faith and order, the Scheme as a whole reveals, not agreement, but agreement to differ; and agreement to differ is no rock on which to build a Church. It will take more than "broadness of sympathy" to transmute this into unity in the truth.

Finally, I would suggest, in all seriousness, that *tu quoque* is not the most constructive or conciliatory answer to theological criticism of the Scheme.

Yours, etc.,
G. B. BENTLEY.

4 VICAR'S COURT,
LINCOLN.
May 3, 1946.

[I will at this point make a few comments and confessions, dropping the editorial "we" and leaving Canon Peacey to reply later. It did not seem to me to be a case of *tu quoque* but of *nos quoque* or of *ego quoque*.

The letters I have received enforce to this extent what I was driving at in the editorial; they illustrate how difficult it is at present to get attention transferred from the S. India Scheme to the condition of the Church of England and its need of reformation. I was not directly dealing with the merits of that Scheme but with the merits of the agitation against it that has been carried on in England, and with the present fitness of the Church of England to seek to put the Church in India to rights. And I adhere to my point. I must maintain my protest, even while letting myself be diverted from it.

I do not say that the S. India Scheme ought not to be submitted to theological criticism in the light of both the Faith and the facts. (I have criticized it myself.) I do not say that it may not yet be much improved. I do not deny that, in view of all that has happened, the Scheme ought, before being implemented, to be fully discussed at the next Lambeth Conference, as the Oxford Mission to Calcutta has recommended.[1] But I try to remember that, when the theologians have done their part, God is better able to take care of His Church than we are. I know that I am prone to draw the catholicity of the Church more narrowly than the Holy Scriptures or the formularies of the Church of England bid me. I know that God can and does bless and fructify projects which I do not see my way altogether to approve. And in this case I confess that I have more confidence in the judgment of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon about the Scheme than in the judgment of either the condemning or approving sections of the Church of England, and certainly of myself.

Further, I ask myself: Does the Church of England officially or otherwise declare itself in such certain terms as Mr Bentley supposes about the nature (the doctrine as distinguished from the fact) of episcopacy? Does it teach that without valid orders (episcopal succession) there can be no Church or apostolic order at all? Is it reasonable to expect Christians, who have not lived under an episcopal order, to commit themselves, before they have learned by experience what it means, to a definite doctrine of its nature? Let it be granted that we are Abraham's seed, though unhappily we do not do the works of Abraham. Does this entitle us, I ask myself, to condemn those who are doing the works, or to make it as difficult as possible for them to seek and claim their rightful place within the seed of Abraham?

Mr Bentley challenges Canon Peacey's assertion that the creeds will be believed in more certainly in the Church of S. India than in the Church of England. The clause in the Scheme to which Mr Bentley alludes is not, I allow, either wisely or happily contrived (not least because on paper it makes his allegation plausible). But so far as I know the Church of England and can ascertain the facts about S. India, to allege that the Church of S. India will bear a less faithful witness to the everlasting Gospel and to the common life in the Body of Christ than the Church of England has been and is doing seems to me a gross presumption. To adduce the parable of the mote and the beam may not be happy, but it is sadly apposite. At any rate it is apposite to me.

But beneath this controversy there lies no doubt a division of belief about the nature of the Church and the Church's ministry; and it is there that theologians have their special work to do. I am not persuaded that those who have most firmly condemned the S. India Scheme have rightly interpreted the testimony of Scripture or of the formularies of the Church of England. For a recent statement of what I believe to be true theological convictions and insights on this subject I would refer to Canon T. O. Wedel's *The Coming Great Church*, which is reviewed elsewhere in this number, and of which I hope an English edition will be produced.—A.R.V.]

[1] See *The Quarterly Paper of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta*, May, 1946.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The deep concern which Canon Peacey has so trenchantly expressed in the current number of THEOLOGY "at the disintegration of the Church of England" will certainly be shared by all those who have the welfare of Anglicanism at heart. Even if some of your readers may agree with what you yourself, Sir, have said in your Editorial—namely, that "he has got the facts . . . a little out of focus"—their sense of shame that such an indictment should even be possible will not thereby be diminished. Yet it is hard to escape from the conviction that this defect, if such it be, arises in no small measure from a certain impatience on the part of the writer. Canon Peacey's experience as a missionary priest has satisfied him that the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon has acted rightly in "adopting" the Proposed Scheme for Church Union in South India (seventh edition). But is he justified in denouncing with such sharpness those who, mainly on theological grounds, cannot bring themselves to share his satisfaction? For he appears to ignore the fact that lively apprehension is not confined to members of the religious orders in the Anglican Communion, nor to "one single school of interpretation," nor even to members of the clergy and laity of these Provinces, but is now shared in many parts of the Anglican Communion, and by some at least whose experience of missionary work cannot be less than that of Canon Peacey himself. These priests may rightly expect a fair hearing when they tell us that they cannot allow the claims of pastoral urgency, however great or insistent, to override those which belong to an integral presentation of the Truth. I would submit, Sir, that it is simply not just to say that men and women who have given of their best for the furtherance of the Gospel are "more intent on excommunicating others than on teaching the faith, as St Paul bids us, through love." Is it not right to say that the more love we feel for others, the more deeply we shall be concerned to ensure that what we offer them is not less than "the whole counsel of God"? Your correspondent complains that "the religious orders . . . should ally themselves, not with the cause of comprehensiveness, a wider charity of truth, which is the heart of catholicism . . . but with one single school of interpretation, a narrow school . . ." Yet he will surely agree that every form of comprehensiveness has its limits, and it would be well if he had told us why South India comprehensiveness fails to include, apparently, Baptists, Swedish Lutherans and the Syrian churches. Why should a "wider charity of truth" be confined to Anglicans, Methodists and possibly the component parts of the South India United Church? Canon Peacey appears to be impatient with any kind of criticism of the Scheme, yet has he not thereby shown himself to be less tolerant than the actual compilers of the Scheme themselves? In the Preface to the latest edition they explicitly invite criticism, and you, Sir, some years ago were careful to point out that it required the closest possible theological scrutiny. If some have acted upon that invitation, can they rightly be blamed? Nor must it be supposed that the critics, such as they are, are to be found only on one side. The

members of the S.I.U.C. are also entitled to express their opinion, and this some of them have done in no uncertain language in a pamphlet recently reviewed in a sympathetic tone in the *Church Union Gazette*. As the pamphlet is hard to obtain in England, it is possible that your correspondent has not seen it; had he done so it is unlikely that he might have been misled into supposing that all the criticism proceeds from "a narrow school." In that document weighty theological arguments are advanced by more than one of the contributors. Such frank and objective acknowledgment of deep-rooted theological differences must evoke the respect of all who are concerned for the Truth, even if such a presentation of authentic Christianity may not meet with their assent. Canon Peacey concludes by exhorting us all to pursue "charity, restraint and development of an obedience to constitutional episcopacy as our first objective today in the Church of England." Many of us are highly impatient with what appears to us to be prelaticism, and if by "constitutional episcopacy" your correspondent means episcopacy as created by the Apostles and perpetuated for at least the first three centuries of the Church's life, we may eagerly range ourselves on his side. Yet it was precisely because some have believed that what was being offered to South India was not "constitutional episcopacy" in this sense, but rather what may be called "episcopal expediency," that they have dared to express their dissent.

I am, Sir,
Yours very truly,
TREVOR JALLAND.

2 PENNSYLVANIA PARK,
EXETER.
May 8, 1946.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Many of your readers will no doubt feel that Canon Peacey tends to exaggerate the lawlessness of the English clergy and the divergent policies of the English bishops; but, even on the assumption that his criticisms are justified, his defence of the South India Union Scheme would appear unduly optimistic. Both his letter and your own leading article appear to me to show no awareness of the seriousness of the step proposed for the South Indian dioceses. Many have spoken and written against the Scheme who have not studied the actual terms of that Scheme. I have before me the seventh edition (revised) of the proposed Scheme, and I cannot see that episcopacy is, as Canon Peacey suggests, "safeguarded, and forms of worship ordered and the creeds believed in more certainly" than in the Church of England in its present condition. I suggest that episcopacy is only maintained in name and not in reality. What a bishop is is nowhere defined (I suppose because definition of any kind would wreck a scheme of such vague nature as this). In fact, his position is so insecure that he may be deprived of his charge by sentence of the Court of the Synod (Sec. IV, 12); but a Synod will contain laymen, as well as presbyters, and, what is more, the laymen will have a majority in the synod (Chap. IX, rule ii, p. 64). This is a grave departure from the ancient

Catholic rule that a bishop is only amenable to the discipline of his comprovincial bishops. If the appointment of a bishop to a vacant see lapses from the Diocesan Council it falls to the Executive Committee of the Synod (IV, 19), which has a majority of laymen. Can it be seriously contended that such an episcopate is in any sense a Catholic episcopate?

Secondly, the forms of worship will, we are told, be "more certainly ordered than in the Church of England." In the Church of England the forms of worship ordered are those of the Act of Uniformity, to which the Prayer Book of 1662 is annexed, subject to the general dispensation of bishops to use any modification allowed in the Deposited Book of 1928. But in the united Church of South India every pastor and congregation shall have freedom to determine the form of service which they will use, subject to certain very wide provisos which need not be detailed here (Chap. X, 2, p. 71 *seq.*). Can it again be seriously contended that this is a more certain ordering of worship than prevails in the Church of England?

Thirdly, we are told that the Creeds will be more certainly believed in than in the Church of England. But by Chap. X, 4 (p. 73), we are informed that "no authority of the Church of South India shall forbid the use of the Creeds, *or impose it against the will of the congregation.* In forms of service issued by the Synod under rule i of this chapter, recitation of the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed may be recommended, *but such recitation shall not be compulsory.*" The Church of England orders subscription to the Apostles' Creed by all candidates for baptism (and therefore also for confirmation), to the two creeds and the Quicunque Vult of all ordinands; and orders all three to be used regularly in divine worship. Is this really a proof of less certain belief in the Creeds than is to be demanded of the new Indian Church?

The remainder of Canon Peacey's letter is mainly an attack on the opponents of the Scheme on the ground of their lack of charity. But true charity will seek to correct the erring. In the case of South India it is simply not true that the "faith does not need defending, but propagating." I submit that if it goes through there will be no assured faith left in South India to defend, let alone propagate.

But, Sir, the fundamental gravamen of the opponents of the Scheme is not even touched in this letter. It is that by consenting to this scheme the dioceses are about to commit a grievous act of schism in wilfully, and without any adequate reason or excuse, separating themselves from the Anglican Communion. A study of the succeeding editions of the scheme shows that it has been progressively watered down in insistence on Catholic faith and practice to accommodate those dissenters who were unwilling to accept it as it stood. This is the solemn charge preferred against the supporters of the Scheme by their opponents; if Canon Peacey can answer it, instead of imputing lack of charity to those who prefer it, we shall be pleased to hear what he has to say.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
GEOFFREY G. WILLIS.

59 CHADWICK AVENUE,
ALLENTON, DERBY.
May 13, 1946.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Canon Peacey's letter in your May number set me looking again through other letters, the originals of which, or authentic copies, lie before me. I will summarize a few: (1) From a priest in S. India this year, begging the English communities not to relax their opposition to the Scheme but to intensify it, since no one else at home seems to understand the real nature of what it is proposed to do in S. India. (2) From a bishop of C.I.B.C., prophesying that the implementing of the Scheme will mean the disintegration of the Anglican Church in India "within the next ten to twenty years," and the passing of all opportunity for the conversion of India away from English Churchmen for ever. (3) From a priest in N. India, ending: "If the Scheme goes through I don't see how I could accept the resulting position even here in good faith, let alone in S. India. I suppose it means I shall have to come home. It will be a depressing end to twenty-three years' work." (4) From a bishop overseas: "I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that if the Scheme goes through there will be nothing for it but to break off communion. The decision will rest with the Synod, but there is little doubt what the large majority will say. What worries me even more is . . . whether this involves breaking off communion also with those who remain in communion with them. Has anyone any clear idea of what the position at home will be?" (5) From a missionary overseas: Negotiations for the formation of a much-needed Province in his area are at a standstill again, because it seems inevitable that the dioceses will "take contradictory action over S. India and all that." (6) From an Anglican Metropolitan overseas and his Comprovincials to the Metropolitan of India: the Scheme as it stands seems to them as missionaries greatly to increase the difficulties of missionary work. They end by reserving the right to take resultant action independently of Lambeth. (7) From another Metropolitan and his Comprovincials, to the same: ". . . The exercise of non-episcopal ministries even for a period is contrary to Catholic order. . . . Reunion proposals which ignore the difference between the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and the heretical sects . . . will cripple the work of the Church in this Province. Some of the larger dioceses in the Province may be seriously hampered in their efforts to convert the non-Christian Indian population [settled there] or to forward organic union with Eastern Orthodox Christians resident within its borders."

Since none of this emanates from the accomplices of our "decadent prelacy" or from the troublesome Religious, it may be admissible. This selection will suffice at least to suggest that it is not necessarily those whose minds are filled chiefly with "the urgency of the need" in India who are taking the wider view.

I need not waste much space on Canon Peacey's complaints of the interest of some Religious Orders in this matter. No doubt they faced the certainty of such misunderstanding before they took their stand, and they seem resigned to it. Canon Peacey would deny to communities with missionary responsibilities now and for the future in India and other Provinces which may be seriously affected by reper-

cussions of the Scheme, the right to make their convictions heard; while he and others who no longer share those responsibilities are to be free to advocate a Scheme which may well make the continuance of their work impossible. I am sure he did not mean to be so arrogant. But his anxiety to preserve monastic "spirituality" goes further. He would seem to deny to Religious as Religious, if not all right to a firm conviction on a disputed question of theology, at least all right to voice it. In so restricting monks to pure pietism, he would have excluded the majority of canonized Doctors of the Church from any voice in the maintenance of the faith. Herr Hitler, he will remember, had the same fears about the dangers to "spirituality" of any contact with contemporary problems. But Hitler was logical, and would have safeguarded the entire Christian Church.

These charges against the Religious are really only a particular in a major question. He chooses to ignore the nature of the whole opposition to the Scheme. It is a fact that to many minds—and some of them not altogether ill-instructed—this Scheme, for all its noble purpose, does seem to abandon some things integral to the Gospel itself. Therefore upwards of 3,000 clergy have signed a declaration to the two Archbishops that they cannot *conscientiously* accept the implementing of such a Scheme. Canon Peacey and all of us would do well to reflect upon the dangerous significance that word *conscience* could have in such a case. The Church of England—it is among her glories—has taught these men that their conscience is not at the disposal of majorities. What are they to do if they find their conscience being forced by the action of a majority? He may think, if he pleases, that they are hopelessly misguided and misinformed in their conscience. But he will admit that even an erroneous conscience must be followed in the end, after deliberation and advice, even against the bidding of ecclesiastical authority.

I am not now contending that these men are right, but putting to him a little point for self-examination. Is it a right or a wrong thing *for him* to do, to assist in thrusting this large number of perhaps mistaken but obviously sincere and determined men into a position where they will be forced to choose between their conscience and their ecclesiastical allegiance? Because that is what he is doing, and upon the rightness of his doing so he will face the judgment of God.

Presumably he has faced this grave question in his own conscience, and has determined that it is right to do it in this case, as "the lesser of two evils." I do not question now the rightness of his decision. But I do urge that he must stop abusing them for having consciences, for he is in their plight. He has been forced by tragic circumstances to drive others to what he knows will be the *sin* of schism (which is *per se* a wrong thing to do) only in order to avoid what he conceives to be a greater evil. They have chosen differently because they weigh the evils differently. But he and they alike are choosing what they must do only in a sincere endeavour to serve God as their consciences give them light. Does he think that so many priests, who on his admission are not unspiritual, can so far have forgotten that they will each give account to God Himself in this grave matter, that they would lightly and for long contemplate an action which we all know to be normally

classed as deadly sin—secession? To put it lower, does he think that anything less than what he calls "the constraint of the Gospel" could drive intelligent men to face a lifetime of frustration in the wilderness, when the times and all their desires (and, in some cases, vows) call for all the service they can render to the Church? For a married man with a family there are cross-currents of duty which may make such a decision even more painful.

Perhaps Canon Peacey has not faced the question of what is meant by "conscience" quite from this angle. But they have had to, and for several years, and there is nothing whatever attractive in the prospect before them. It is human to flinch from such a witness as they conceive may be laid upon them, to distrust their power to bear the loneliness and misunderstanding and, above all, the breach with so much that means so very much to every English Churchman, which it must involve. It is comprehensible that they should try to prevent its being necessary, and even speak unfairly sometimes of those who seem to be uncomprehendingly forcing this suffering on them. I have been greatly humbled and moved to a deep pity in these last few years as I have watched this prolonged and in some cases agonizing conflict of loyalties in the minds of many of these men, with its different decision in different cases. It is not suitable that Canon Peacey in his situation should read homilies to such men (beside whom I am altogether unworthy to stand) on the propriety of their losing their life to save it.

Yet it is not difficult to forgive him, even for this. He is so obviously very unhappy. I think and hope he might be less so if he would rid himself of the assumption that all who find they cannot take his own easier way are necessarily moved by baser motives than the supporters of the Scheme.

But your May Editorial, Sir—ought that to be quite so easily forgiven? We look to you (and seldom in vain) for informed and illuminating comment. THEOLOGY, it appears, is impatient of controversy on these theological issues, and would prefer "an ecclesiastical agitation . . . for transforming our decadent prelacy into a renewed episcopate at home." For pity's sake, Sir, why pick on the poor bishops for your red herring? Granted that they are irresponsible and virtually irremovable, and that some of them are apt to trade upon it. Is not the same true of Deans, Canons, Archdeacons, Incumbents, Chancellors, Registrars and Patrons? The laity, too, fortified in their statutory "spiritual" rights as ratepayers against any effective spiritual discipline, are all in the same condemnation. The functioning of our episcopate is only one result of the construing of churchmanship in all its functions largely in terms of statute law for the last 400 years. The whole system is disastrously irrelevant to the contemporary situation of the Church. But mere justice compels one to admit that it is now only "prelacy"—the ceaseless, unconstitutional (and sometimes unprincipled) surreptitious manipulation and diplomacy of the bishops—which somehow manages to keep the whole vast collection of other irremovable irresponsibles still just functioning together as something fairly like a single corporate entity. It might turn out to be a good thing in the end if the whole ecclesiastical machine did "seize up." That is certainly what would happen now if you removed the grease of

"prelacy"—with a brief interval, perhaps, of apotheosis of the Church Assembly. But if that is what you want you ought to say so, and not start tally-ho'ing after the decadent prelates while you leave, *e.g.*, the irresponsible patrons (including "party trusts" of all kinds) serenely free to dictate far more effectively to the church life of a majority of parishes in the country. You cannot deal with these things piecemeal, as things are now. And you are going to have a nicely confused and strenuous controversy on your hands if you tackle them all together—as things are now.

I hope I am not taken for an uncritical admirer of prelacy—in any case I have said my little say about it in a forthcoming essay—but, once more, the need is for more and better theology. Until the New Testament doctrine of the Church is recovered and understood and accepted, not only by the bishops but by the Church at large, we have nothing whatever to substitute for our "statutory" conceptions of Churchmanship but some different bits of machinery, not necessarily more efficient, and a secular democracy thinly ecclesiasticized. Such books as Fr Hebert's *Form of the Church* and Dr Thornton's *Common Life in the Body of Christ* have begun to point us to a solution. (I apologize for citing Religious who have publicly criticized the S. India Scheme, but this seems to be another need which others have not done much to meet.) But they have only begun. It is partly because schemes of the S. India kind will make it impossible to think clearly about this that they arouse such anxiety. They virtually ignore two things of cardinal importance: (1) The force and necessary emphases of some Protestant doctrines (*e.g.*, "justification by faith" is mentioned *once* in the S. India Scheme, in a parenthesis). (2) The vitally scriptural character of the Catholic doctrine of the Church (with which that Scheme seems to be irreconcilable in some of its main provisions). In the long run our only chance of avoiding a schism in the Anglican Communion and achieving a constructive basis for the unity of Western Christendom lies in making a real theological synthesis of these omitted items. (The S. India Scheme has avoided this prerequsite of unity, and instead organizes amalgamation. A serious attempt is being made at the present time to do something of this kind. The danger is that "practical" men, by forcing on some local scheme which they feel is urgent for local reasons, will precipitate the whole issue of "conscience" for us all, before the Church at large has seen a way clear in the theological questions. If we come to that catastrophe (and I think the result must be a catastrophe to us all) we shall all be partly to blame—not least the would-be Gamaliels who saw the dangers and would not oppose them.

You say, Sir, that you would like some alternative definition of "the limit." If I may venture a suggestion, it is that on a page headed in large black letters THEOLOGY one should write as though an improvement in institutions were any remedy for a deep-seated and virulent theological disease.

GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

NASHDOM ABBEY,
BURNHAM,
BUCKS.
May 16, 1946.

[Dom Gregory's letter has arrived just when this number of THEOLOGY must go to press, so that there is no time or space for further comment. All that I must add at the moment to what I had already written above is that by "a decadent prelacy" I meant the present English church system as a whole; I have never supposed that we may impute responsibility for it to the bishops alone.—A.R.V.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE COMING GREAT CHURCH: ESSAYS ON CHURCH UNITY. By Theodore O. Wedel. The Macmillan Co. (New York). 1945. $2.00.

Dr Wedel is Warden of the College of Preachers and Canon of Washington Cathedral. His book is very important, because it gives succinct expression to the new type of twentieth-century Anglicanism which is slowly but steadily making headway in several parts of the world wide Anglican communion. The new Anglicanism takes account of the two most significant features of twentieth-century Church life: the rediscovery of the biblical theology (especially of the Church and of eschatology) and the drawing together of the churches in what is today called the ecumenical movement. It is an Anglicanism which is of the twentieth century but is not modernist, Catholic but not Anglo-Catholic, and Evangelical but not individualist.

Canon Wedel describes how the rediscovery of the *ecclesia*—the people-Church of the New Testament—has taken place through the activities of both scholars and practical men. "I write as an Anglican," he says, "and cannot escape the conviction that in Anglicanism one such people-Church, retaining a Catholic Church order, yet remaining evangelical, became partially realized. Anglicanism has lived for four hundred years by its Book of Common Prayer. The very title indicates a break with medieval tradition and yet a retention of a Catholic idea of the Church" (pp. 20*f.*). He regards the Prayer Book as the deposit of that distinctive treasure which the Anglican Church will one day contribute to the fullness of the Great Church of the future. "Why was the Anglican Church the only Church to write and to live by a Book of Common Prayer? It had required all the centuries of Christian history since the apostles to garner that treasure. Liturgical prayer is not produced in a day or by one generation. Theological genius does not suffice. No individual, however gifted, can do more than contribute a small portion. Liturgy is a community possession. It grows only in the soil of a long tradition, nurtured in that soil by thousands and millions of Christian hearts lifted up in common orison. Only a Spirit-bearing Body can create liturgical worship." Liturgical prayers are those which, "like the dialogue of the Eucharist itself, have sung themselves into the memories of generation upon generation of worshippers." "The very name, Book of Common Prayer, we believe to symbolize what the apostles meant by the Communion of Saints and by the community of the Holy Spirit" (pp. 109-14).

From these brief quotations it will be seen that Canon Wedel is one who loves the Anglican Church with a rich and understanding love, which is all the deeper because, unlike many other converts, he has not

ceased to understand and sympathize with the Church of his birth. He left the Mennonites when, at the age of eighteen, he became organist in a little Episcopal church in the Mid-west, after which his conversion to Anglicanism was almost immediate and complete; but twenty years passed before his ordination in 1929. In the meanwhile he had been Professor of English at Carleton College.

One leading theme of Canon Wedel's book is that Anglicanism, with its Prayer Book, is well fitted to express the true New Testament conception of a people-Church; the other is that the Great Church, when (as Dr 't Hooft might say) it is at last liberated from its imprisonment in the churches, will find in the Anglican tradition an invaluable guide. For that tradition incorporates not only the personal faith and warmth of Evangelical devotion, as distinct from the individualism which the Reformers rejected but which nevertheless the Protestant churches inherited from degenerate medieval Catholicism; it also incorporates the fullness of Catholic Church order, including episcopacy, which Anglicans as Catholics must never be expected to give up. The importance of the historic episcopate is clearly seen and stated, as symbolizing and securing the unity and continuity of the Church. The Bishop as "the breaker of the Bread" must form part of any apostolic Church order. But all non-Anglican theories of sacerdotalism and "apostolic succession" (as Newman, for example, formulated it) must be renounced. P. T. Forsyth and Presbyterian Church polity are not so far removed from a sound understanding of "the Bishop in the Church of God" as to lead one to suppose that the episcopate must for ever be the symbol and cause of Church disunity rather than of unity.

Only extensive quotation, which space forbids, could do justice to Canon Wedel's scholarship and insight or illustrate the excellence of his writing and style. He does not deal in detail with the ecumenical movement as it exists today (and it is a mistake to say that a World Council of Churches has been in existence since 1937 [p. 24]; it was only "provisional"). Nor does he deal in detail with the proposals of particular reunion schemes; yet his book is highly *practical*, since, if Canon Wedel is right, the first and major contribution which Anglican churchmen can make towards the progress of Church unity will be the reconversion of Anglicans to Anglicanism.

Alan Richardson.

The College,
Durham.

Primitive Marriage and European Law: A South African Investigation. By D. W. T. Shropshire, C.R. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

One of the gravest sociological problems in Africa—particularly in South Africa—is the disintegration of Bantu family life resulting in gross immorality and widespread juvenile delinquency. In his new book Dr Denys Shropshire makes available much valuable material for an understanding both of the situation itself and of the causes which have produced it. During a tour of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia he collected the views of both European and African com-

mentators. The former included magistrates, Native Commissioners, social workers, and ministers of religion; the latter chiefs, native students and graduates, Bantu members of the Native Representative Council, etc.

The principal cause, it is well known, of the present trouble is the drift of the younger African men from the disciplined tribal life of the kraals to the city compounds. They usually leave their wives behind and only too often desert them, entering upon temporary unions with the women of loose morals who frequent the towns. Behind all this one sees the spectre of economic pressure, for the high cost of living and the lack of suitable accommodation make the establishment of a real home almost impossible.

The situation is further complicated by the confused state of the present marriage laws, which vary in many important details from one territory to another. Generally speaking, there are three ways in which the South African native can be married—by native custom, by the Church, and by the civil authority.

Civil marriage is far from popular; and Dr Shropshire quotes a group of natives as saying that "to the general opinion of Africans it is regarded as a marriage without dignity and honour," because it is so cheap (which the Government had imagined would be its chief attraction) and is deprived of any socio-religious character. Dr Shropshire also gives evidence of the complicated nature of Christian marriage in South Africa owing to clumsily framed Government regulations, and he admits that its obligations are often only dimly understood. He does not entirely accept the strong criticisms which many missionaries direct against the Enabling Certificate which the Native Commissioner issues before a Christian minister is permitted to solemnize a marriage, but he agrees that a simpler procedure would meet the case equally well.

Dr Shropshire maintains that for all but the completely detribalized Africans native marriage, with a system of *lobolo* purified from its present commercialism, is the most satisfactory arrangement. After this has been registered it should receive the blessing of the Church when the parties are Christians. To those who find themselves drawing away "from primitive conditions but who are still attached to their own tribe and people, and are not yet fully Europeanized," he suggests that after the completion of the procedure outlined above a "legal certificate" should be issued by the Native Commissioner, who "would then explain . . . the new legal consequences of a transitional kind." From the legal point of view there may be certain objections to this proposal, but students of Bantu social life will do well to give it sympathetic consideration; and it is to be hoped that the Government authorities concerned will keep in view the many important points, both critical and positive, which this book brings out when they proceed with the urgent task of legislative reform. At the same time the picture which is given of the general degradation of native life, particularly in urban areas, makes it clear that the most effective action can only be taken in the sphere of economic and social reform.

Hoxton. St John Evans.

CHRISTIAN MORALS. By Lindsay Dewar and Cyril E. Hudson. University of London Press Ltd. 7s. 6d.

Jeremy Taylor has justly observed that a sound moral theology is necessary to the life of Christianity. What he and his peers attempted to do for the science in their day needs to be done on an extended scale in ours, so that a corpus of moral theology may be built up which will be suited to Anglican requirements as much by its dogmatic background as by its principles and casuistic methods. This task, so solidly commenced by the Bishop of Oxford, is well continued in this book by Canons Dewar and Hudson, whose previous work on the subject is known to us all, and one rejoices over that which they hope is not too marked, the Anglican tone of the book (preface). It is hardly possible to overstress three of the points discussed in their fifth chapter—namely, that the authoritarian bias is not a necessary characteristic of moral theology, and that it is essential in this respect to build up a moral theology on the specifically Anglican basis; that there is no intrinsic necessity to treat of the practice of the confessional in a work on moral theology (the Sunday sermon and the addresses to parish organizations will surely be the normal instrument in the Anglican communion); that the aim and scope of the science is wide. One will not quarrel with the authors' analysis of the terms moral, pastoral and ascetic, provided that it be borne in mind that moral and ascetic (or pastoral) theology are one science, the aim of which is to bring men to Heaven. The error of post-Tridentine theology in separating the one from the other led directly to that legalistic tone which predominates in Roman Catholic moral theology today, just as the obscuring of the idea of the beatific vision by neglecting ascetic theology turned moral theology into moralizing in the English Church.

The rehabilitation of casuistry has now gone very far and Anglican moral theology will be chiefly concerned in this connexion with principles and method. It was Bishop Henson who pointed out that a true casuistry exists for the morally perplexed, not for the morally polluted, and this the authors stress. But a fuller treatment of the vexed question of mortal and venial sin might be advisable if this book is to be used (as one hopes it will be) as an introduction to the subject for ordinands and others. The chapter on Nature and Grace is valuable, and indeed the whole book, whilst written in the true spirit of Anglican liberal conservatism, is so concerned with the implications of theology for the present moral crisis and so devoid of stuffiness that one sees hope for a not too distant flowering of "pracktick divinity" amongst us. Authority and Canon Law, with special reference to the Church of England, are discussed—a subject which will compel detailed investigation if foundations are to be well laid. The authors are helping Anglicans to realize that they no longer need look to writers of another tradition in moral theology. The Israelites can whet their instruments at home without visiting the Philistine forges.

H. R. McADOO.

CASTLEVENTRY RECTORY,
ROSSCARBERY, CO. CORK.

Stewards of the Mysteries of God. By R. D. Middleton. Dacre Press. 2s. 6d.

Of the many difficulties which, since the Reformation, have dogged the footsteps of the Church of England, the most persistent is that of maintaining pastoral contact with the people. When Dean Church said of his parishioners at Whatley, that he rarely got under their skins, that sometimes he tickled or pinched them and never knew why, he expressed the melancholy experience of many able and devout clergymen. The rise in political and social importance of those to whom the Church of England has never meant much has accentuated this pastoral weakness. Any attempt to remove it is to be welcomed.

The opening chapters of this little book deal with the priest's prayers and studies, his conduct of public worship, and his sermons. They are full of good advice. The difficulty is to practise it. A deeper devotion and a wider learning are much to be wished among English clergymen, and the complaints of the laity suggest that there is room for improvement in the conduct of services and in preaching. But one cannot get rid of the troublesome fear that all this might leave the Church of England as high and dry as it is now.

Our pastoral difficulties are rooted in the change from the medieval conception of the priesthood, which is registered in our forms of Ordination. In abolishing the Confessional and the Mass, our Reformers removed the personal contact of the priest with his people and went far to destroy the public sense of his importance. He lost his spiritual authority. He was no longer feared. Has the Church of England found a practical alternative to the medieval priest? The present book, with its emphasis on confession and the Eucharist, will be mainly helpful to those young clergymen who, while remaining loyal to the Church of England, incline towards a medieval conception of their office. If the majority of the laity were also so inclined, this procedure might be more hopeful. But many will not have it. And what is to be done with them?

Some passages in this little book seem overoptimistic. It is, for example, a little hard on John Keble that his confession of his failure to know the lives of his people should be followed by the assurance that—

"If the parish priest really desires to get into touch with his flock, he will certainly eventually succeed, providing that he is prepared to use prayer, tact, patience, and common sense."

And which of these virtues was wanting in Keble? Again:

"If divine service, no matter how simply offered, is always regarded by the priest as an offering to Almighty God, it will again become more attractive to the people."

If only experience confirmed it, how happy we should be!

A. C. Scupholme.

Ugthorpe Vicarage,
Whitby.

MEDWAY ADVENTURE. By Joseph McCulloch. Michael Joseph. 12s.6d.
THE HUNGRY SHEEP. By Roland Roberts. James Clarke. 7s. 6d.

Medway Adventure has this great merit, that it describes what is actually being done. Indeed, in some form or other it is being done in many places. Those who forgather at No. 20 Prospect Row, Chatham, are, as Mr McCulloch recognizes, not unique. But it is excellent that some account should be given of what is happening, since it is apt to be supposed that nothing is happening, because it does not show or make a noise. We could wish that this book might be read by those who are continually urging us to forward movements. Here is movement, and forward, but also patience and thought. The author has subjected himself to the discipline of locality. The world is not his parish. He is a citizen of the Three Towns. Indeed, his book might be called a study in Christian citizenship. No. 20 Prospect Row is the centre of a concern for human relationships in the home, the school, the factory—and, most excellently, it is a branch of nothing. It is not mapped or taped. It is content to meet.

Having said this, it is perhaps inconsistent to complain of gaps, but gaps there are, and the reader may find himself wondering how much importance Mr McCulloch would allow to that which he omits. Is the means in danger of becoming the end? Can "group-integration" become a *substitute* for "building up the body of Christ"? Perhaps it is unfair to ask such questions of what is put out as an interim report, yet the "religion of Jesus" of which it continually speaks seems to leave out a great deal of the good news of Christ. Certainly the Gospel may have to be presented in instalments, yet it is not the most unacceptable instalments which should be reserved. They are the most challenging and also the heart of the matter. It is to no less an adventure than redemption and resurrection that we and those who inhabit the banks of the Medway are called.

Mr McCulloch is strongly anti-Manichean, and that is most necessary, yet there is an element from the abyss in sex which mankind has sensed and thankfully known not to be imputed in marriage. We suspect that what he unromantically calls "the man-woman relationship" can be unduly romanticized.

Canon Roland Roberts seems to have met some astonishingly stupid clergymen, but the plain fact is that the "hungry sheep" are baffling all of us, stupid and less stupid alike. He has some good plain pastoral advice to give us, and that is probably all that, short of the coming of a prophet, we can be given. Yet this book has confirmed our impression that, if those who have been chaplains to the Forces have something to tell the civilian clergy, those who have continued as civilian clergy have even more to tell the chaplains to the Forces. Canon Roberts, writing as a former chaplain, reveals no awareness of certain significant movements, and surely some of the horses that he beats have long been dead. Which of us is so unfashionable as to sing the third verse of "All things bright and beautiful"? There is a good sincerity about this book. It displays a virtue which it recommends. The author has put his personality into his pages. Yet still

at the end of it the "hungry sheep" look up at us from its cover and still we are asking the question with which it closes: "What can *we* do about it?" Canon Roberts has much that is excellent to say, but we doubt whether, speaking American, we can say to him: "You've *said* it."

FRANK BENNETT.

NESTON-IN-WIRRAL.

SHORTER NOTICES

The World Christian Digest, No. 1. Edited by Roger H. de Pemberton. Pathfinder Press, Rochester. 1s.

This seems to be quite an enterprising publication. It contains extracts from articles on a large variety of subjects. Many of the writers are well known. At present it will be an occasional publication, but it will be published monthly as soon as Paper Control restrictions are removed.

A. R. V.

Forgiveness and Reconciliation. A Study in New Testament Theology. By Vincent Taylor. Second Edition. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

This is a reprint of the third volume in Dr Taylor's trilogy. It was first published in 1941, and was reviewed in THEOLOGY, xliv. 187 *f.* (March, 1942).

The editors of the series "Unto a Full-grown Man" are doing a great thing for the religious education of young people in a library of lessons on Faith and Order which will be completed in ten volumes. Nothing comparable in scope or scholarship has been available to teachers before, and the enterprise deserves the serious consideration of those who have been waiting for lesson material at the highest standard. The present volume (No. V in the series), on *Church History*, by Mrs Duncan-Jones (S.P.C.K., 3s.), gives a conspectus of Church history in a form which young people will find attractive.

The teacher of young people will also find fifty-two lessons of unusual quality in *Following Christ* (Mowbrays, 5s. 6d.), by Sibyl Harton. Fifteen virtues or qualities are considered as revealed in their perfection in our Lord, then as exemplified in the life of a saint, and finally as they must be reproduced by ourselves as Christians. The abundance of biographical illustration makes a book which the parish priest can use for many purposes.

Leaders of Youth Fellowships should not miss two recent books, which are full of practical suggestions. They are, *Youth Fellowship Programmes* (National Society and S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), by Gordon Fallows and Stella Lord, and *Youth Fellowship Work* (S.P.C.K., 2s.), which gives the experience and experiments of the Scottish Episcopal Church. *Three-Minute Epilogues* (National Society and S.P.C.K., 1s.), by A. Elliott-Cannon, provides thirty-seven useful collections of prayers for use at clubs and fellowships.

Methods of Teaching Religion to Children (National Society and S.P.C.K., 5s.), by Marjorie E. A. Clark, combines an outline of child-study with an account of suitable teaching methods with a clarity that will make the book of real value to the young Sunday-school teacher.

REGINALD LUMB.

CHISLEHURST.

Prayer and the Lord's Prayer. By Charles Gore. Allen and Unwin. 2s. 6d.

It is fifty years since the material of this book first appeared as articles in *The Commonwealth.* Though the intervening years dim the view somewhat, it is possible to see part of the outline of a great mind through the small window offered by this book. You can see between the lines the dim figures of the Bishop's audience too, and their essential rationalism, whether Christian or atheistic and materialist. You can see the great man explaining to them weightily, but briefly and simply, the structure of prayer, and its classic expression in the Lord's Prayer, from consideration of general reason and the Holy Scripture.

The audience has changed now. Neither the Christian nor his critic is so bound by rationalism. The order of our consideration of reason and Scripture has changed; the Lord's Prayer is seen more in its eschatological setting in our Lord's teaching, and this setting makes for more urgent and compelling reading than Bishop Gore's calm reasoning. In one sense, therefore, this reprint is untimely; yet the greatness of the Bishop's words remains, and his materialist opponents are still with us, with their popular science quite fifty years behind the times. The very fact that Messrs Allen and Unwin have thought fit to reprint this book shows the need for small but thoughtful and theological books on prayer. The theology and approach of Mr Jenkins's *Prayer and the Service of God* were more timely, but might well have profited from the clarity of Bishop Gore's exposition.

The Great Commandment. By Peter Green. Mowbray. 2s. 6d.

Canon Peter Green's book is addressed in the first place to the clergy to persuade them to devote their time to unashamedly spiritual ministrations and to leave the social tasks to the laity. It is therefore of some interest to the laity, but perhaps most of all to those seeking ordination. It should make the latter long to grow old, providing that they can grow old as profitably as Canon Green. They must be prepared to listen respectfully to their elder and better telling innumerable stories and quoting numerous verses; at times they will wonder how the argument is proceeding. The stories, however, never become sentimental and the thesis is made abundantly clear, and a good deal of the Gospel expounded on the way.

Canon Green nicely combines an evangelical insistence on the personal and spiritual change the Gospel must work in a man, with a Catholic stress on the sacramental and public worship, with a special

insistence on the importance of daily eucharist and offices in parish life. His case, oversimplified and muddled as it is in places, is perhaps as important as much of the Evangelism Report or even the strictures of Mr Bennett.

Sunlight and Shade in Bermondsey. By Arthur Sinker. Mowbray. 3s. 6d.

Parish magazine literature is a subject deserving of more study. The late Canon Sinker's style might be called "The Old Curiosity Shop." In this selection, however, our suspicions are aroused as to whether the Bermondsey exhibits are genuine local pieces, or fakes to please patronizing outsiders. There are some good pastoral points, heavily wrapped up in a wealth of allusion from every quarter of the world and literature. Perhaps the paper shortage has been a blessing to the parishes, even if the publishers might be more judicious in their choice of little books.

J. H. CHURCHILL.

CAMBERWELL.

The Doctrine of the Church as Held and Taught in the Church of England. By Leonard Hodgson. Blackwell. 1s. 6d.

This is a statement written for the Commission on "The Church" appointed by the World Conference on Faith and Order. In preparing it Professor Hodgson consulted with six theologians, "three representing the catholic and three the evangelical tradition in our Church." The collection of relevant passages from the official formularies of the Church is useful. Passages are included from the Canons Ecclesiastical, but not from the Homilies for a reason which is not explained. The rest of the statement is inevitably less satisfactory. Perhaps in so limited a space nothing better could be attempted. The thesis is suggested that the Church of England as a whole is the *locus* of a dialectic; this may be true, but it is not clear how far or in what sense this has been "held and taught" in the Church of England or is acknowledged today. It is one thing to say that the Church of England is the *locus* of a dialectic between the insights of traditional Catholicism and those of the Reformation; and another to say that it contains two sets of members—catholics and evangelicals, and that the dialectic takes place between these two sets instead of in the Church as a whole and in every one of its members. This statement with its bland division of anglicans into catholics and evangelicals no doubt reflects recent notions of comprehension. It would not be easy to document it before the nineteenth century, and it is to be hoped that it will not be possible to do so for much longer.

A. R. V.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher